## THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF UTAH

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

v.

Case No. 2:16-cr-00020-DN

MARLON ALONZO SMITH,

District Judge David Nuffer

Defendant.

This case is on limited remand from the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals to consider whether to issue a certificate of appealability. "A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." "To achieve this, [the defendant] must show 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and . . . whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling."

Mr. Smith cannot make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right with his Motion for Relief Under Hazel-Atlas.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Smith's arguments under FED. R. CIV. P. 60(d)(3) and the Supreme Court's opinion in *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*<sup>5</sup> challenge only his criminal case and his conviction and sentence.<sup>6</sup> Under binding precedent, such

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Order, United States v. Smith, no. 24-4066 (10th Cir. June 5, 2024), docket no. 284, filed June 5, 2024.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> United States v. Wicken, 514 Fed. App'x 721, 723 (10th Cir. 2013) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Docket no. 273, filed Apr. 29, 2024.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> 322 U.S. 238 (1944).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Motion for Relief Under Hazel-Atlas at 6, 8-26.

challenges regardless of their label "must be considered a second-or-successive collateral attack" subject to authorization requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h).<sup>7</sup>

Because Mr. Smith did not first seek authorization from the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals for the filing of his Motion for Relief Under Hazel-Atlas His as a second-or-successive motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, subject matter jurisdiction is lacking. No reasonable jurist would find the denial and dismissal without prejudice of Mr. Smith's Motion for Relief Under Hazel-Atlas for lack of jurisdiction debatable. Therefore,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Mr. Smith is DENIED a certificate of appealability. Signed June 7, 2024.

BY THE COURT

David Nuffer

United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> United States v. Baker, 718 F.3d 1204, 1207 (10th Cir. 2013).